

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 23, 24, 26-36, 38-48 and 50-58 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 23, 24, 35, 36, 47 and 48 are amended; and claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 17-22 are canceled.

In numbered paragraph 4, pages 4-14 of the final Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 17-24, 26-36, 38-48 and 50-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, "Windows 95 Uncut," 1995, IDG Books Worldwide, pages 31, 32, 57, 115, 134, 137, 138, 139 and 246. In numbered paragraph 5, pages 14-20 of the final Office Action, claims 23, 24, 26-36, 38-48 and 50-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Simpson publication in view of U.S. Patent 6,606,101 (Malamud et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,097,390 (Marks). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 17-22 are Canceled

In the interest of expediting the prosecution of the application, Applicant cancels claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 17-22 without prejudice.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 17-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 23, 24, 26-36, 38-48 and 50-58

Applicant has disclosed of record an exemplary hybrid cursor with a variable bubble in size and/or color, along with various alternative displays of numbers (Figs. 7A-C), alphanumeric characters (Figs. 8B and 8C) and/or other symbolic displays (Figs. 6 and 8A). Support for these and other exemplary hybrid cursors can be found in the specification at paragraphs [0052] and [0054]-[0058].

The foregoing features are broadly and variously encompassed by independent claims 23, 35 and 47. For example, claim 23 recites, among other claimed features, at least two different images for a cursor, including a first image which comprises a pointer arrow having a tail, and a second image which comprises a hybrid consisting of a pointer arrow with a variable graphic in place of said tail, wherein said variable graphic is capable of a numeric display relating to a parameter of a process; and means for normally displaying a cursor with said first image and for switching the display to said second image upon initiation of the dragging of at least one user interface object.

On page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the Simpson publication "does not disclose said condition is the dragging of an object, and said displaying means switches said display upon initiation of a drag operation." However, the Examiner asserts that the Malamud et al. patent discloses using "information pointers" in drag and drop operations. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's ultimate conclusion.

Fig. 2T of the Malamud et al. patent illustrates a document 44A denoted by "Travel Plans" 44B intended for dragging and dropping at either a folder icon 46A denoted "My Folder" 46B or a printer icon 47A denoted "My Printer" 47B (e.g., col. 12, line 65 through col. 13, line 11). However, as relied upon by the Examiner, the Malamud et al. patent actually teaches that only when the document 44A is dragged *over a possible target object* does an information box appear that contains said information to inform the user (e.g., col. 13, lines 20-25). This is different from, and actually teaches away from, switching a display to a second image upon *initiation* of

the dragging of at least one user interface object, as variously recited in Applicants' claims 23, 35 and 47.

Further, the Examiner appears to rely on the Fig. 7-3 illustration in the Simpson publication of various combinations of an arrow with either a question mark or an hour glass shown next to the arrow, but they do not appear to teach or suggest, among other claimed features, a hybrid consisting of a pointer arrow with a variable graphic in place of said tail, wherein said variable graphic is capable of any one of a numeric, alphanumeric and/or symbol display relating to a condition of a process, as variously recited in Applicant's claims 23, 35 and 47.

Even if any of the pointers in Fig. 7-3 of the Simpson publication could have been somehow broadly construed, the Simpson publication would not have taught or suggested at least two different images for a cursor, including a first image which comprises a pointer arrow having a tail, and a second image which comprises a hybrid consisting of a pointer arrow with a variable graphic in place of said tail, wherein said variable graphic is capable of a numeric display relating to a parameter of a process; and means for normally displaying a cursor with said first image and for switching the display to said second image upon initiation of the dragging of at least one user interface object, as further recited in claim 23, and as variously recited in claims 35 and 47.

As set forth above, the Malamud et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Simpson publication. Further, the Malamud et al. patent would not have taught or suggested at least, among other features argued of record, a hybrid consisting of a pointer arrow with a variable graphic in place of said tail, as variously recited in claims 23, 35 and 47.

Bridging pages 15 and 16 of the final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the Marks patent discloses "that a visual pointer can take different shapes to indicate operations such as drag and drop." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's ultimate conclusion.

The Marks patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Simpson publication and the Malamud et al. patent. Rather, the Marks patent was applied by the Examiner for its disclosure of a visual pointer in the form of an arrowhead, crosshairs, a vertical line, or a hand (e.g., col. 1, lines 39-44). However, the Marks patent, alone or in combination with the Simpson publication and the Malamud et al. patent, would not have taught or suggested, among other features argued of record, at least, among other features argued of record, a hybrid consisting of a pointer arrow with a variable graphic in place of said tail, as variously recited in claims 23, 35 and 47.

At least for these reasons claims 23, 35 and 47 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from the respective independent claim, and as previously argued of record, recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 23, 24, 26-36, 38-48 and 50-58 are allowable. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 28, 2009

By:



Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620